

Sunnyside Gold Corporation (SGC) Meeting
Draft Notes
Oct. 6, 2011, 2pm

Attendees:

Nathan Longenecker – VP and General Counsel SGC/Kinross, 1888 Sherman Street, Ste. 780
Denver, CO 80203 – phone: 775-829-1000; cell: 303-718-4508; email:
nathan.longenecker@kinross.com
Sabrina Forrest – EPA Assessment Program
David Ostrander – EPA PAR program
Richard Sisk – EPA Enforcement Program
Steve Wharton – EPA Remedial Program
Scott Wilder – EPA Enforcement Program

Purpose: Begin a dialogue related to the funds that SGC is offering to address the water quality problem.

SGC's Emphasis:

1. SGC is offering funds to address water quality problem constructively with minimal transaction costs and believes local and cooperative solutions without Superfund would be in everyone's interest.
2. SGC is not married to a particular remedy, i.e., the \$5 million that SGC offers to put towards water treatment could be used for other activities.
3. SGC does not believe the contaminants are theirs, wants to avoid court, and thinks the Consent Decree settlement with the Colorado Water Quality Control Division provides them liability protection.
4. SGC understands that EPA/Superfund interest has been the impetus for this \$6.5 Million offer to the stakeholders and BLM.
5. SGC would like to avoid listing and asked if listing is inevitable; EPA indicated that there are other ways to get work done, but to access significant resources, a listed site is needed.
6. SGC has no interest in mining in this region.
7. SGC does not know the specifics of what BLM may have in mind or the efforts they are undertaking.
8. The \$6.5 Million was not scientifically based and was a back of the envelope calculation.
9. SGC asked if we are committed to sending out 104(e) letters; we answered to the affirmative and discussed that we need more information to be able to better determine responsibility.
10. SGC indicated they are also researching other potentially responsible parties to bring to the table.

EPA's Emphasis:

1. Above all, EPA is also interested in water quality improvement.
2. EPA indicated to SGC that we are open to non-NPL options; however, if resources are needed beyond those that are available from PRPs and the community, a listing is necessary

for EPA to access significant resources. EPA later discussed that a process/framework is needed regardless of which entity leads the effort.

3. EPA primarily listened and asked questions around the above topics.
4. EPA and other stakeholders likely define "collaboration" differently.
5. EPA emphasized that the 104(e)s are necessary so that EPA has the information to judge who is responsible and what resources those responsible parties may have to assist in addressing the water quality problems in this area.